

claims has not attained a separate status in the art so as to be considered a separately patentable invention.

Similarly, the subject matter of the Examiner's Group III has been classified by the Examiner in the same Class as the subject matter of the Examiner's Groups I and II. Search and examination of the two separate Subclasses of the Examiner's Groups I, II and III would not present an undue burden on the Examiner.

Finally, the Examiner is urged to appreciate that the present application is a 371 U.S. national phase of a PCT, such that the principles of unity of invention apply. The Examiner has not established, such as by citation to any prior art, that the claims fail to define a single general inventive concept. Withdrawal of the restriction requirement and lack of unity of invention assertion is requested.

Rejoinder and allowance of any claim defining a method of making and/or using a product defined by an allowable claim, at an appropriate time, are requested.

As for the extensive election of species, the requirements are traversed as the Examiner has not established that the noted species are separately patentable. Withdrawal of the requirements is requested.

For the purposes of being responsive only, and with traverse, the applicants elect the following species (following the Examiner's labeled paragraphs):

¶A. as an election of one of the alternatives of molar percentages of claims 2 and 16-19, or some other molar percentage, subparagraph (i) (20%),

¶B. as an election of one of the alternatives of percent of the tripeptides of claims 4 and 20, or some other disclosed percentage, subparagraph a. (30%),

¶¶C. as an election of one of the alternatives of molar percentages of claims 5 and 21, or some other molar percentage of the disclosure, subparagraph a. (70%),

¶¶D. an election of one of the alternatives of endoproteases of claims 6-11, or some specific combination thereof should not be required as the subject matter of the Examiner's Group I, which is elected above, does not include the alternatives of this species election (i.e., claims 6-11), are not included in the elected Group I and the subject matter of this species election will presumably not be examined with the elected subject matter,

¶¶E. an election of one of the alternatives of proteases of claim 8 should not be required as the subject matter of the Examiner's Group I, which is elected above, does not include the alternatives of this species election (i.e., claim 8), are not included in the elected Group I and the subject matter of this species election will presumably not be examined with the elected subject matter,

¶¶F. an election of one of the alternatives of secondary contacts of claim 8 or some other disclosed secondary component should not be required should not be required as the subject matter of the Examiner's Group I, which is elected above, does not include the alternatives of this species election (i.e., claim 8), are not included in the elected Group I and the subject matter of this species election will presumably not be examined with the elected subject matter.

The claims of the elected Group are believed to read on the elected subject matter.

The Examiner's requirement for